



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20591
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,093	05/10/2001	David F. Nellis	0942.5110000	4750

2611 7590 01/29/2003

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3934

EXAMINER

LU, FRANK WEI MIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1634	9

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/852,093

Applicant(s)

NELLIS ET AL

Examiner

Frank W Lu

Art Unit

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-949) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1634

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's response to the office action filed on November 12, 2002 has been entered as Paper No:8. The claims pending in this application are claims 1-24 with claims 13-24 withdrawn from consideration as the result of the restriction requirement. Rejection and/or objection not reiterated from the previous office action are hereby withdrawn.

Election/Restriction

2. This application contains claims 13-24 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 5. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Note that claim 2-12 are dependent on claim 1.

5. Claim 1 is rejected as vague and indefinite in view of the phrase "digitizing an image of said one or more fragments to measure intensity values for each fragment from said image"

Art Unit: 1634

because the phrases "one fragment" and "each fragment" in the claim does not correspond each other since the phrase "each fragment" suggests to have at least two fragments. Please clarify.

6. Claim 2 is rejected as vague and indefinite because it is unclear what it intended. Since the distribution step and processing step are two different steps in claim 1 and claim 2 that is used to further limit the distribution step should not have a processing step. Please clarify.

7. Claim 5 is rejected as vague and indefinite because claims 1 and 5 do not correspond each other and claim 5 does not further limit claim 1. Note that the catalytic result in claim 1 is derived from analyzing a fragment population model while the catalytic result in claim 5 is derived from an effective dilution factor. Please clarify.

8. Claim 6 recites the limitation "complete digestion of a fragment" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since claim 1 does not specify "the catalytic activity" as "complete digestion of a fragment". Please clarify.

9. Claim 10 recites the limitation "at least one of DNA fragment and RNA fragment" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since claim 1 does not specify "macromolecular fragments" as DNA fragments or RNA fragments. Please clarify.

10. Claim 11 is rejected as vague and indefinite because claim 11 does not to further limit the distributing step of claim 1 since the distributing step in claim 1 and the digestion step in claim 11 are different method steps. In fact, the digestion step in claim 11 is happened before the distributing step in claim 1. Please clarify.

11. Claim 12 is rejected as vague and indefinite because claim 12 does not to further limit the distributing step of claim 1 since the distributing step in claim 1 and the dilution step in claim 12

Art Unit: 1634

are different method steps. In fact, the dilution step in claim 12 is happened before the distributing step in claim 1. Please clarify.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. No claim is allowed.

14. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94

Art Unit: 1634

(December 28, 1993)(See 37 CAR § 1.6(d)). The CM Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242 or (703)305-3014.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank Lu, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 305-1270. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones, can be reached on (703) 308-1152.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the patent Analyst of the Art Unit, Ms. Chantae Dessau, whose telephone number is (703) 605-01237.

Frank Lu
January 21, 2003



Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634